

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTO	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
				·	
		1	EXAMINER		
		ĺ	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				20060917	
	INTERV	IEW SUMMARY	DATE MAILED:		
All participants (applicant, applicant) 1) HAL WACHSMAN		I): (3)			
(2) Edward Truc	1/= 0 - 0	(4)			
Date of Interview 9-13-06	7				
Type: Telephonic Televide	o Conference Rersonal (con	vis given to ⊟anolicant 🛱	, annlicant's renress	entative)	
Exhibit shown or demonstration co		•	арриоанто горгоос	manvoj.	
Agreement was reached. Agreement was reached. Agreement was reached. Agreement was reached. Agreement was reached was reached was reached. Agreement was reached was reached was reached was reached. Agreement was reached was	nd various other class;	that had FICFA	! 75 (4/ abje	dirs;	
Description of the general nature of the cluiby were of the Northern view.	discussed to overcon	1-	comments: fright of by what is the Most	ved ancedounds echion subje, believed to as et al.	
retexuie subject,	to Enther search o	undreview.			
(A fuller description, if necessary, amust be attached., Also, where no attached.)					
It is not necessary for application	ant to provide a separate record o	of the substance of the interview	<i>i</i> .		
Unless the paragraph above has b S NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCL action has are ready been filed, AF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEV	LUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONT	INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Sec	tion 713.04). If a re	ply to the last Office	
Examiner Note: You must sign this	form unless it is an attachment to	another form.		Or and the second	

FORM PTOL-413 (REV. 2-98)

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 713.04 Substance of Interview must Be Made of Record

Except as otherwise provided, a complete written statement as to the substance of <u>any</u> face-to-face or telephone interview with regard to an application <u>must be made of record in the application,</u> whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

§1.133 Interviews

- (b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111 and 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)
- § 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete a two-sheet carbon interleaf Interview Summary Form for each interview held after January 1, 1978 where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks in neat handwritten form using a ball point pen. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, or resulting in an examiner's amendment that fully sets forth the agreement are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate paper number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is removed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number of the application
- Name of applicant
- -Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- -Name of participant(s)) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An -centification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). (Agreements as to allowability are tentative and do not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.)
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- -Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

The Finan also contains a statement reminding the applicant of his responsibility to record the substance of the interview.

It is ussireable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his obligation to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

it should be more through nowever, that the Interview Summary Form with not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview:

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A chel description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an contribution of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- a) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary
 Form completed by the examiner,
- 5) a bit is instillination of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbation of highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or broast of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.
- # 4.18 - diparion of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- Triffaporaphate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expensed to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete or accurate, the examiner will give the applicant the date of the notifying letter to complete the reply and thereby avoid abandonment of the application (37 CFR 1.135(c)).

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the evaluation of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability is should be patentable out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability is should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability is should be patentable out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability is should be patentable out in the next Office letter. If the control of patentability is should be patentable out in the next Office letter.